

16. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein said hardening includes irradiating an ultraviolet ray by a lamp scanning system.

17. (Original) The method of claim 16, wherein the liquid crystal injection holes collectively harden by the lamp scanning system.

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of March 3, 2003 has been received and contents carefully reviewed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-3, 5-8 and 13-15.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-10, 12, and 13. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,359,442) in view of Nakamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,181), Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,435), and Julke (U.S. Patent No. 4,222,635); rejected claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Nakamura et al., Inoue et al., and Funada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,610,510); rejected claims 9, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Nakamura et al., Inoue et al., Julke, and Funada et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 2 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner stated "buffering the 'time'" could not be determined. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2 and 13 is moot in view of the aforementioned claim amendments. Further, Applicants respectfully submit no new matter has been entered by the claim amendments above.

The rejection of claims 1, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Nakamura et al., Inoue et al., and Julke is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example “an elevator for conveying a liquid crystal display panel having a liquid crystal injection hole from the injecting apparatus to the sealing apparatus; a residual liquid crystal remover for removing contaminated liquid crystal at a periphery of the liquid crystal injection hole; a sealer for sealing the liquid crystal injection hole with a sealant; ...” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, including Tanaka et al., Nakamura et al., Inoue et al., and Julke, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Nakamura et al., and Inoue et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 10 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example “conveying a plurality of liquid crystal display panels each having a liquid crystal injection hole from an injecting apparatus to a sealing apparatus; removing contaminated liquid crystal at a periphery of each liquid crystal injection hole; sealing the liquid crystal injection holes of the liquid crystal display panels with a sealant using a roller;...” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, including Tanaka et al., Nakamura et al., and Inoue et al., teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 10 and 11-17, which depend from claim 10, are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner states “Rolling was well known as evidenced by the above listed additional reference, and would have been obvious for that reason.” (Office Action at p. 4).

Applicants respectfully submit however, that, while in Funada et al. a roller is used to remove “the air bubbles 9 and the excess liquid crystals from the cell” (See Col. 4, lines 28-47

and Fig. 3 of Funada et al.), the present application uses a roller to seal the liquid crystal injection hole with a sealant as claimed. See, for example, p.10, lines 6-15 of the instant application.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: June 3, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Song K. Jung

Registration No.: 35,210

Kurt M. Eaton

Registration No.: 51,640

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant